

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY

JUN 8 1961

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION
& EDUCATION

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Christian Journal of Opinion

A Conservative Nation in a Revolutionary World

Leadership of the non-Communist world has been thrust upon the United States, but one great difficulty is that at a time when the world needs social and economic revolution ours is an essentially conservative nation. It is true that we once had a revolutionary impulse, and one of the revolutionary forces that brought political independence to countries in Asia and Africa was the same belief in the dignity and rights of all men that has been our inspiration. Yet our revolutionary impulse has been so individualistic that it really represents an unfinished and one-sided revolution, for it does not deal realistically enough with the economic needs of men. Indeed, the very individualism that has informed our revolution has been so twisted that it has been widely used to support the power of private economic interests to subvert the general welfare.

In our national life today, our economic practice is often better than our theory. There has been among us in recent decades a new impulse directed toward economic justice of which we should be proud, but it is frequently obscured by our individualistic slogans and symbols. We cannot easily export this new impulse to other countries where some of our commercial interests, especially in Latin America, have exploited the people. They have at times supported reactionary dictatorships in order to reap quick profits. Even when our spokesmen speak eloquently about our genuine concern for the needs of neglected and exploited peoples there is a tendency to accent freedom far more than justice. The banner of freedom alone is not enough.

It was a sign of our failure as a conservative na-

tion to understand other nations whose first priority is social and economic revolution that our Government chose to support conservative Cuban exiles in its recent effort to overthrow Castro. The assumption that the rank and file of Cuban peasants and workers would rise to support any revolt against Castro showed that our wave length was different from that of most Cubans.

Our Administration generally shows a fine understanding of the needs of other nations, and the President's new initiatives in Latin America hold great promise. But it will be remembered that many of Mr. Kennedy's greatest admirers detected an irrational element in his attitude toward Cuba during the campaign last October. He quickly dropped this, but it may have meant more than appeared: that on this subject Kennedy had a blind spot that did not fit his other attitudes.

Our conservatism as a nation is combined with a tendency to absolutize communism as the one great evil that threatens mankind. The idea that communism is one vast undifferentiated mass of evil also hinders us as we face the problems of the real world. Already there are differences within the Communist world between Poland and Hungary, between Russia and China and between Yugoslavia and the more orthodox Communist states.

Moreover, we would take a wiser view of the Communist threat if we realized that communism is not in intention a criminal assault on humanity but rather one way in which economically underdeveloped nations can find a short cut to a social, industrial, technological revolution. (It is one of the great tragedies of modern times that this revolutionary program is linked with an absolute ideol-

Vol. XXI, No. 10, June 12, 1961 \$5.00 per year; 25 cents a copy

ogy, involving atheism, which engenders a fanatical spirit that leads to tyranny and with which it is difficult for others to live.) But if we see communism as offering this short cut we may more readily understand that unless nations find another way to the social, industrial and technological revolution they need, they are likely to be open to communism. To see this to be true may deliver us from our tendency to look upon communism as the devil. It has a positive role and can only be opposed by a positive alternative. Indeed, it required Communist pressure to cause us to take seriously the need for social change in Latin America.

This does not make it less our responsibility to help nations to resist the imposition of communism upon them by military aggression or to help them to find another way that is compatible with spiritual and cultural freedom, but it may take away from our reaction to the Communist threat some of the moralistic panic that causes us to do the wrong things.

One of these wrong things is our tendency to take self-defeating action toward a nation that begins to make Communist noises and to experiment with relations with Communist nations. Secretary Herter's famous remark placing Ghana in the Soviet orbit showed this to be an almost unconscious automatic response.

Our response to Cuba has been a dramatic illustration of this tendency. We assumed that Communist leanings in Cuba were like the beginning of leprosy. We finally created a situation that made it natural for Castro to increase his dependence on Russia. We boycotted his nation; under real provocation we broke relations. But we did not use imagination and ingenuity to beguile Castro into a truly neutralist channel.

We made the same mistake before with Nasser and Iraq, and stumbled out of some of its worst effects. In the case of Cuba we added blunder to blunder. Now we must avoid making an absolute evil out of Castroism and resist the tendency to quarantine any other Latin American country that shows signs of being infected by it!

It now appears that we will not repeat this error, since we are going all out to aid Brazil in spite of the fact that its Government does not line up with us against Castro. Now that we have discovered Latin America and have learned through hard lessons the desperate needs of its people, it is to be hoped that this is one area where we can have a

creative policy. Some other failures may be the result of geographical inaccessibility; failure here would be caused by psychological distance.

There is some interrelation between the three tendencies noted in this editorial: our national conservatism, our black-and-white view of the conflict with communism; and our self-defeating reactions against nations that show signs of Communist infection. Together they call for searching self-examination. Radical change in us is necessary if we are to become well-equipped to inspire and help other nations to find alternatives to communism.

J. C. B.

THE MONTGOMERY SAVAGERY

MONTGOMERY was the city in which the Negro bus boycott—under the leadership of Martin Luther King and without the benefit of the Supreme Court decision—won the first victory of the Negroes against segregation. That the "Freedom Riders," white and Negro students who were challenging segregation on interstate buses, were so severely attacked in Montgomery, reveals the depth of the resentment of the white population over their defeat. The violence in Montgomery is also a dismal reminder of the stubborn recalcitrance of all the former Confederate states. We did not really need any reminder because only six per cent of the schools of these states have been integrated in the seven years since the Supreme Court decision.

The Montgomery violence is, in short, symbolic of the depth and the breadth of the problem of racial justice in this nation, of the full dimension of the "American Dilemma," in Gunnar Myrdal's phrase. The critical reaction to the incident in the European and African press is also a reminder that this unsolved problem of American democracy seriously complicates our task of leadership of the democratic nations, for our race problem, serious as it is, is only one sector of the world-wide rebellion of the colored races against the white man's dominion and arrogance.

We have analyzed this problem in all its dimensions again and again, particularly in our May 29 special issue on the race problem. There is, therefore, occasion for only two further observations, both prompted by this recent revelation of the white man's stubbornness in yielding to obvious standards of equal justice and in recognizing the validity of the colored man's resentment against

injustice. One observation pertains to the significant leadership of the Negro church in the revolt, and the equally significant lack of leadership of the white Protestant church in this crucial struggle for primary justice. Some of the white pastors have been heroic, but the church as a community, allegedly a "community of grace," has been woefully lacking in relevance and vitality.

If the church fails to become an instrument of justice in the complicated issues of economic justice in an industrial society, it is always possible to understand, if not excuse, its delinquency by observing that it is not easy to implement the basic imperative of the love commandment with the nice calculations of distributive justice required in economic affairs. But there is no such excuse in the realm of racial justice. There the issue is crystal clear. The question is simply whether we are prepared to treat our fellow man with the respect that his innate dignity as a human being requires and deserves. That the church should have failed to meet this primary test of its moral vitality is a fact of grave concern. Could it be that the Protestant church in America has sunk to the insignificant status of a white middle-class conventicle, where man's pride is nurtured rather than disciplined?

The other observation pertains to the degree to which particular nations and sections of nations are tainted with the universal corruption of group arrogance. We in the North have rightly tried to overcome self-righteousness by calling attention to the universality of the problem of color prejudice, North and South. But it is time that we emphasized the importance of restraining the virulence of the sin and condemned those who have used both state and church to express, rather than restrain, this universal corruption.

It is important that in America, despite the depth of our problem, the Negro is not as hopeless as in South Africa, for instance, where the state and ninety per cent of the church are an instrument of this primary corruption of human nature.

It is equally important that here the hope of justice for the Negro is derived from the accepted standards of a whole nation, as distinguished from the mores of a parochial culture infected with the remnants of slave mores. As a nation we are not quite as moral as our Bill of Rights. But we can be grateful for the fact that the Bill of Rights is superior to our own morality and that standards developed in the 18th century purification of Christian norms are now the legal guides of the whole nation. The Enlightenment may have been too optimistic in its estimate of human virtue. Fortu-

nately, however, that error proved to be an instrument of a pure standard that now restrains us from being as consistently evil as our natural propensities would allow. This will be true at least as long as the Federal Government is as rigorous as it now is in enforcing the law by the imposition of Federal power on the violence of Southern racism.

The whip of the law cannot change the heart. But thank God it can restrain the heartless until they change their mind and heart. R. N.

"A CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER"

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S unhappiness with the conveyors of public information, as reflected in his recent speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, revives an old issue and at a most unfortunate time. He spoke in the days just following the Cuban landings, when the Administration was far more eager to sweep its immediate blunders under the carpet than it was to launch into long-range discussions of the philosophy of the people's right to know.

The President asked the editors to restrain the free flow of information when the national security was involved. The editors' initial response was entirely innocent. They had always done this; they had never done otherwise; they never would. If this sounded like agreement, the public was completely fooled. It was no agreement at all; it was simply a definition of the problem.

Nothing is settled until there is agreement on what the national security is, and who is to decide. Government is always inclined to be niggardly with information; national security is a big drawer for a bureaucrat in which many secrets can be hidden. The press is always inclined to demand a much more precise definition of national security and those matters that involve it.

On three recent occasions the nation has discussed with some concern its own right to know. One was the U-2 incident, when an intelligence plane was shot down over Russia, and many Americans began to wonder openly about the necessity for so much talk, so much false information and true, so much public discussion of the incident.

The same debate was heard during the fiasco in Cuba. While the Government contributed to the news blackout with false information and no information at all, the people responded with something less than democratic fervor in demanding a part in the public debate of that debacle.

Close on the heels of Cuba came the third occa-

sion in which Americans expressed open doubt about their right to know. Everywhere, questions like these were heard: "Do we really have to send that astronaut into space with everybody watching? What if the shot fails?"

It is important to examine these three lapses of faith in democracy in view of Mr. Kennedy's request to the nation's press. After Alan Shepard's successful flight, the doubts subsided, and Americans could boast again about their open society and compare it favorably to other societies that accomplished their cosmonautical feats in secret. Failure and embarrassment seem to be the critical ingredients in these incidents. In the Shepard case, it was the fear of failure and embarrassment, which evaporated once the suborbital shot went off successfully.

Is this, then, the situation: that the Government desires a guard to protect itself from revealing its failures and embarrassments, that the people wish to abdicate their responsibility for public decision when they fear failure and embarrassment? Is this the way the definition of national security shapes up? If so, it is a new one, and one that the President will not find the information media ready to accept. A free people, growing in the arts of self-government, must function in failure as well as in success.

The limitation upon democratic freedoms that

the media will accept is Justice Holmes': a free society, acting through its government, may restrain basic liberties when the exercise of those liberties would present "a clear and present danger" to the national security. True, there are still ambiguities in this definition, but its emphasis is in the right place and it provides the soundest basis for intelligent resolution of this problem.

Presumably, the President would like a sharper demarcation of the danger line, and there are some signs that he may move to get it. Shortly after his speech to the editors, he held a rocking chair conference with a representative few of them. It appears that in the course of his remarks he made reference to the possibility of a governmental officer with power to declare the clear and present danger line, a peacetime Byron Price. There have been hints in the newspapers of such a press czar.

Relevant to the same development was a comparatively innocuous and inconspicuous action in the House of Representatives recently. In a near-unanimous resolution the House set down what it thought of Fidel Castro. One phrase used a series of interesting words. The Congressmen called him a "clear and present danger" to the United States. Is the legal stage being set for further governmental restrictions of the people's rights? R. T. B.

A Powerful Force To Be Reckoned With

Progressive Republicans and the New Coalition

SENATOR JACOB K. JAVITS

FOR YEARS we have been hearing about coalition government in Washington—a coalition of Southern Democrats and Republicans who have often controlled Congressional action.

At this session of Congress a new coalition is emerging—a coalition of Democratic and Republican liberals who have so far managed to score some major legislative victories.

The significance of this new voting alignment is that there is now widespread acceptance of the fact that liberal Republicans—or progressive Republicans, as I prefer to call them—have become a potent force in Congress. Indeed, in this 87th Congress, on some crucial issues, they already have and may continue to represent the balance in vot-

ing in both the Senate and the House. At the midpoint in this session, for example, three of the Administrations' major social-economic measures—minimum wage, depressed areas and temporary unemployment compensation—would have probably gone down to defeat without the support of some Republicans.

Here are some examples of how this new voting alignment has worked in both the House and the Senate at this session:

(1) January 21—

The House voted 217 to 212 to take away from the Rules Committee the power to bottle up liberal legislation. Twenty-two Republicans voted with the majority.

(2) March 16—

The Senate defeated the Byrd Amendment, 44-42, that would have restricted the bill to grant temporary unemployment compensation. Five Republicans voted with the majority.

SENATOR JAVITS served four terms in the House of Representatives before being elected to the Senate in 1956. Throughout his career he has been a distinguished champion of civil liberties and civil rights.

(3) March 29—

The House approved the depressed areas bill, 251 to 167. If 41 Republicans had not voted with the majority, the bill would have failed, 210 to 208.

(4) April 18 and 19—

The Senate defeated a series of amendments that would have limited the coverage of the minimum wage bill. From 9 to 13 Republicans sided with the majority on these amendments, and in each case their support was essential to the defeat of the amendments. On the most controversial, 13 Republicans joined 43 Democrats to defeat the Monroney Amendment to drastically reduce the number of workers covered, 56-39.

(5) May 3—

The House agreed to a conference report on the minimum wage bill on a 230-196 roll call vote. If 33 Republicans had not voted with the majority, it would have been defeated.

The Administration's domestic legislation so far would have suffered serious setbacks had it not been for some Republican support. I believe that we can look forward to a continuation of this new voting alignment in the remaining months of the session—and that it is likely to be manifested on aid to education, medical care for the aged, housing and civil rights.

But let us understand that the role of liberal Republicans is not to come to the rescue of the Administration on these measures, but to act where action is called for in the national interest. Bipartisanship is not a one-way street. The Administration must seek the ideas as well as the support of a liberal coalition, and these ideas must be reflected in its programs.

To some extent this was done on the new minimum wage law, where progressive Republican views were reflected in the final measures. On other domestic issues, the Administration has an even better opportunity.

On medical care for the aged, for example, the Administration bill will have tough sledding in the Senate unless it accommodates the views of some Republican Senators who believe that any "medicare" program should have the benefit of the varying medical facilities of the respective states, should provide for doctors' preventive care and should pay some attention to safeguarding the voluntary health plans to which 120 million Americans belong. Thus, if the Kennedy Administration is going to rely heavily, as it will have to, on Republican votes to get the "medicare" bill through the Senate, it seems only proper that the measure

should reflect some Republicans' principles, too.

In no field is a liberal Republican—Democratic coalition more important than in civil rights legislation, which is urgently needed for our own people and to improve our standing in the world. The Administration shows every disposition to forego any call for civil rights legislation at this



session in order to appease Southern Democrats, who ironically have shown little disposition up to now to support the Administration.

Surely, the President recognizes that he cannot solve the civil rights problems by executive action alone. The hard core of resistance in certain areas of the South to the implementation of the Constitution will not be ended by anything less than new laws passed by the Congress. Under President Eisenhower, in 1957 and 1960, civil rights legislation was passed by a Republican—Democratic coalition. Such a coalition can prove effective again if only the Administration will stop sweeping the issue under the rug.

Along with the awareness that Republican progressives represent a growing force in Congress and the recognition that the Administration must depend on their support must go a responsibility on the part of the Administration to give them an opportunity to make a contribution to the legislative result.

A Truly National Party

For my part, as a Republican, our primary purpose should be to see that a Republican Party is a truly national party of service to the American people. Simply to limit ourselves to the role of opposing is not compatible with the objectives we want realized for the American people. Republi-

cans of whom I speak do not believe in heavy federal spending programs as necessarily a miraculous cure-all for economic ailments; but we do see for the Federal Government fulfillment of its legitimate role as a facilitator and cooperator with the private economy in the development of the country, the advancement of individual welfare and human rights, and in meeting our international responsibilities.

From that philosophic springboard, such Republicans have developed positive approaches to the critical problems facing us today. We should continue to originate ideas. But it is also our duty to bring about effective bipartisan action when our views are being met.

For the future, I believe the Republican progressive force will continue to grow in both strength and influence in Congress. It is clearly the way of the future for the Republican Party—and every analysis of the 1960 election bears this out.

The Republican Party lost the 1960 election in the big metropolitan cities and their suburbs. Of the 40 cities in the country with a population above 300,000, the Republicans carried only 14—and nearly all of these were in the South and West. In seven states carried by President Kennedy—New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota and Illinois—Republicans built up pluralities totalling 1,563,992 outside their respective metropolitan areas, only to have them offset by Democratic pluralities of 2,260,062 in the big cities. Moreover, in a study of 19 suburban areas, the Republican decline in the suburbs was equal to that of adjoining cities. In the New York City suburban area, for example, the national Republican ticket lost 95,447 votes from the 1956 election while Democrats gained 163,210 votes in the same areas.

Modern, Not Outdated Policies

The answer to this decline is not a Republican swing to the right—to reaction or ultra-conservatism. The answer is to identify the Republican Party with a modern forward-looking policy that finds a broad base of support in urban areas.

I believe this is why progressive Republicans in Congress are emerging as a powerful force to be reckoned with. It does not mean that Republicans must turn over a new leaf. It does mean that we must be faithful to the two most significant historical concepts of the Republican Party: (1) the struggle for civil rights and human dignity, as enunciated by Abraham Lincoln; and (2) the oper-

ation of the private economic system in the public interest, as advocated by Theodore Roosevelt.

Today Republicans should be (1) hardheaded about money; (2) strong for civil rights legislation; (3) committed to the private economic system (including labor, management, agriculture and voluntary associations) and the need for seeing it operated in the public interest; and (4) committed to the Government's role to carry on those functions which the private economy cannot undertake or cannot undertake as well.

The Republican National Platform of 1960, following the lines of the Task Force report by the Republican Committee on Program and Progress headed by Charles H. Percy of Chicago, carries out this position. These references are an interesting commentary on the fact that when Republicans get together in national conclave they come up with modern, not outdated policies. The Republican Party platform of 1960 states these principles very well:

Government's primary role is to help provide the environment within which the individual can seek his own goals. In some areas this requires Federal action to supplement individual, local and state initiative. The Republican Party has acted and will act decisively, compassionately and with deep human understanding in approaching such problems as those of the aged, the infirm, the mentally ill and the needy.

The Percy report picks this up in the following words:

The government has a positive responsibility to its people to maintain the conditions for a sound, productive economy. Without this there can be no opportunity, no assurance of meaningful life for anyone.

A Government has a responsibility to move effectively against either depression or inflation. This responsibility to help keep the economy operating well has been wisely fixed in the Employment Act of 1946.

These ideas are implemented, for example, in such fields as the domestic economy, research and education in both documents.

The Republican Party Platform states:

Our continuing and great national need is for basic research—a wellspring of knowledge and progress. Government must continue to take a responsible role in science that worthwhile endeavors of national significance are not retarded by practical limitations of private and local support.

The Percy Report states:

That every American must have access to the best education his individual endowments enable him to use. To achieve this requires the strongest combined efforts of government

at all levels to stimulate the pursuit of excellence in our schools.

That every American of whatever race or creed must have the chance to make his best contribution to society, to himself and his family, and to earn a status of respect.

Those of us who believe in this kind of Republicanism have always had to fight against the efforts of liberal Democrats who would smother us by identification with them. But we have a distinctive position that we must implement and carry forward in the interest of our party and country.

Our position is based on the recognition of the private economic system as a prime guarantor of freedom and the determination that it should operate in the public interest. With all the loyalty to the private economic system expressed by many Democrats—and I feel it is sincere—there is nonetheless inherent in their political philosophy an unwillingness to sacrifice much for this principle in the way of legislation they consider to serve a socially desirable objective and which may vest more power over the private economy in the Federal Government.

I believe Republicans must find a way to accomplish socially desirable objectives with prime reliance on the private economic system as I have defined it and scrupulous attention to preserving it.

CORRESPONDENCE

Contemporary Labor-Management Relations

TO THE EDITORS: In "Piety and Maturity in Labor-Management Relations" (March 6), Mr. James Kuhn accuses the National Council of Churches, in its review of the 1959-60 steel industry dispute, of "pietistic hand-wringing"; Mr. Kuhn appears to prefer neanderthal neck-wringing. It is to be hoped that in his forthcoming book, *Democracy in the Grievance Process*, Mr. Kuhn takes a less anarchic view of "the fight for security." If the search for maturity in collective bargaining is not to deteriorate into irrelevant reiterations of archaic altruism, the Church Militant must cease fighting already-won battles.

Mr. Kuhn rightly recognizes that the Federal Government has encouraged and supported labor unions for nearly thirty years, but he disregards their resulting economic progress. It would be difficult for an objective observer to reconcile the steel union leaders' initial demands in 1959 for a "billion dollar bundle" with Mr. Kuhn's characterization of the strike as a "fight for security." "Willingness of workers to sacrifice four months' needed income" was partly subsidized, at least in some states, by strikers' ability to draw unemployment compensation.

Mr. Kuhn accuses the National Council of Churches of assuming but not documenting the

costs of the strike; instead he confuses, but does not document, the issues. He neglects to distinguish between progress through "technical improvements" (which both labor and management agreed was *not* an issue) and lack of progress through "work rules" which the steel companies fought unsuccessfully to change, contrary to Mr. Kuhn's assertion that "in steel, managers have always been free to change work rules." He defends workers' "few minutes or hours of idleness and rest in the midst of heavy, tiring work" without regard for vast improvements in working conditions. It is union leaders' insistence on preservation of the *status quo* that is threatening jobs on railroads, in coal mines, in auto plants and in steel mills.

In unenlightened social gospel style Mr. Kuhn blames management for restricting production and jobs when a poor market does not demand production. He accuses managers, not consumers, of idling steel making capacity, and he considers management's "economic power over workers . . . unquestioned by the public" despite a mass of protective labor legislation.

The old frontier "power against power" policy advocated by Mr. Kuhn has been countermanded by a new world situation. Mr. Kuhn proposes that public interest continue to be "hammered out" in further tests of fundamental strength, but foreign threats to "bury" us economically may impose peaceful labor-management coexistence and may enforce a mutuality of interest. Contemporary international competition offers no collective bargains.

Let us agree that this is not the time to "shrink from the use of power and economic force," not in extending the thirty-years-war to which Mr. Kuhn would return us, but rather to extend freedom from insecurity beyond preoccupation with our own already affluent security to re-occupation with securing economic freedom for others.

HARRY F. SUCCOP
Princeton, N. J.

Mr. Kuhn Replies

TO THE EDITORS: (1) Christians might do well to get over their squeamishness in contemplating power among contending social groups. Power encounters, even strikes, are hardly "neanderthal neck-wringing"; they are usually highly sophisticated, useful processes. The steel strike involved no violence. Workers helped close and open the plants in orderly fashion, the companies subsidized the strikers with vacation pay, unemployment benefits and prepayments to returning strikers. The negotiators argued, appealed and calculated their cases with at least the same dignity as feuding Congressmen or the business men battling for control of the Alleghany Corporation.

(2) Secretary of Labor Mitchell issued an analysis of the steel strike in January 1961 that concludes: "The actual adverse economic effects of steel strikes have usually been overestimated. . . . A major reason . . . is that when a strike approaches a critical stage, pressures upon parties to settle become sub-

stantially irresistible." The report documents the minute effect of the 1959 strike upon the economy.

(3) I did not and do not "blame" managers for restricting production to half-capacity for years on end in the interests of profitable operations. They exercise that great power, of course, within a coercive set of circumstances even as democratically elected union leaders exercise their power to urge workers to strike.

(4) If we are truly worried about being "buried" economically, let us turn our attention to the great economic problems that we face. Let us not rush to pluck the mote of work rules from labor's eye, while we are blinded by the beam of extravagant unemployment and vast, unused industrial capacity. Neither the hot passion of dispute nor social gospelism will aid us; let us try to understand the nature, uses and *limits* of power in a complex society. Being under the judgment of God, let us beware of finding all foresight and goodness on one side and only unreason and stupidity on the other.

JAMES KUHN
New York, N. Y.

Eichmann:

A Chance to Redeem Ourselves

TO THE EDITORS: Dr. Niebuhr's editorial on the Eichmann trial (April 3) is the best writing on the subject I have seen in a long time.

The question is, what can we, Christians, do so that said trial will not remain that of an individual but of Nazism itself and of all those who abetted it, either by commission or omission.

The latter sin is ours. Indeed, it is evident that

Race in America

Copies of the May 29 special issue are still available at 35¢ each. Special quantity rates: 11-99 at 20¢ each; 100 or more at 15¢ each.

The cover drawing and the line drawings in the "Race in America" issue and in the current issue are the work of Richard O. Keys.

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY
PHIL-RELIG & EDUC PER
5201 WOODWARD AVE
DETROIT 2 MICH
9005 9-61R 4

had not Christian conscience, the world over, been lulled to sleep through centuries of religious hate-intoxication, Hitler and his hirelings would never have dared perpetrate the monstrous crime. Those Christians, Protestant and Catholic, who joined the humanists and the atheists in saving the Jews were but a few individuals scattered among all the European nations. And, as far as the United States—"under God"—is concerned, its door remained closed to those marked for the holocaust.

And now Eichmann, and one more chance given us to begin redeeming, somewhat, ourselves. Or are we going once more to be onlookers, washing our hands both of the guilt and the suffering?

Could we not at least run a petition to make it known to Israel that whatever the legal side of the matter, we want the trial to be that of Nazism's philosophy, which could run its infernal course only because of the anti-Semitism latent in the subconscious of millions of Christians, in Germany and elsewhere, indoctrinated for hundreds of years by faulty religious teaching.

Could not we have the belated courage of making Eichmann's trial the opportunity for acknowledging publicly our own wrong as Christians, and for pledging ourselves to have no rest until the religious aspect of anti-Semitism be eradicated through a re-evaluation of Christian teaching regarding the Jews?

CLAIRE HUCHET BISHOP
New York, N. Y.

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Christian Journal of Opinion
537 WEST 121 ST. • NEW YORK 27 • N.Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR AND JOHN C. BENNETT, *Chairmen*
WAYNE H. COWAN, *Managing Editor*
ROBERT G. BATSON, *Assistant Editor*
M. SEARLE BATES WALDO BEACH AMOS WILDER
ROBERT MCAFEE BROWN F. ERNEST JOHNSON
ROGER L. SHINN HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
RICHARD T. BAKER J. OSCAR LEE
TOM F. DRIVER ROBERT W. LYNN
KENNETH W. THOMPSON WILLIAM LEE MILLER

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HENRY SMITH LEIPER JOHN A. MACKAY
FRANCIS P. MILLER M. M. THOMAS
WILLIAM F. MAY J. B. DUROSELLE
HERBERT BUTTERFIELD SIDNEY LANIER

CONTENTS

PROGRESSIVE REPUBLICANS AND THE
NEW COALITION

SENATOR JACOB K. JAVITS